

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments**

Claims 1-49 and 57-66 have been cancelled. Applicants wish to reserve the rights to file one or more continuation applications based on the cancelled subject matter.

Claims 50 and 51 have been amended for clarity only.

Claims 50-56 are amended to delete “patterned” from the preamble to provide an antecedent basis.

No new matter is introduced in any of the above amendments.

### **The Response**

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 50-52 and 54-56 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 42-44 and 46-48 of US Application No. 10/665,992.

US Application No. 10/665,992 has issued as US Patent No. 7,156,945. Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the rejection.

#### **35 USC §102(b) Rejection**

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 32, 33, 44, 45, 49 and 60 are allegedly unpatentable under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Aufderheide (US 4,714,631).

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 32, 33, 44, 45, 49 and 60 have been cancelled.

#### **35 USC §103(a) Rejection**

(a) Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Voss et al (US 6,426,143).

Claim 8 has been cancelled.

(b) Claim 28 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Warther (US 5,495,981).

Claim 28 has been cancelled.

(c) Claim 34 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) as applied to Claim 32, and further in view of Todd et al (US 5,368,902).

Claim 34 has been cancelled.

(d) Claims 35-37, 39-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) in view of Todd et al (US 5,368,902) as applied to Claim 34, and further in view of Penterman et al (US 2002/0196390).

Claims 35-37, 39-41 and 43 have been cancelled.

(e) Claim 42 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) in view of Todd et al (US 5,368,902) and Penterman et al (US 2002/0196390) as applied to Claim 41, further in view of Rogers et al (US 6,337,761).

Claim 42 has been cancelled.

(f) Claims 57-59 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) in view of Brummett et al (US 4,368,281).

Claims 57-59 have been cancelled.

(g) Claims 64-66 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aufderheide (US 4,714,631) as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Mori (JP 57-177029).


Claims 64-66 have been cancelled.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the application is in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Viola T. Kung, Ph.D. (Reg. No. 41,131)

**HOWREY LLP**  
2941 Fairview Park Drive  
Box 7  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Ph. (650) 798-3570  
Fax (650) 798-3600